

### REMARKS

Applicants file this response in reply to the Office Action dated August 23, 2004. Claims 1-62 were cancelled in a previous amendment. In this response, Applicants amend independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82 to more particularly define a feature directed to "providing a user with the opportunity to select a program from a list of at least one program that will air outside a program listings time frame which is currently available to the user." Support for this amendment can be found in the specification on page 24, lines 27-30, which provides that a display screen can contain "a list of programs ... that are not yet within the current time frame of the program guide."

After entry of the amendment, claims 63-86 continue to be pending in this application.

### Drawing objections

In the Office Action dated 08/23/04, the drawings were objected to by the Draftsperson under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. In response to this objection, Applicants submit herewith twenty-four (24) sheets of formal drawings to replace the twenty-four (24) sheets of informal drawings filed with this application. Applicants submit that the formal drawings are in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is requested.

### Claim rejections

In the Office Action dated 08/23/04:

(1) Claims 63, 66-70, 74-77, 79-82, and 84-86 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lawler et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,699,107 (hereinafter "Lawler");

(2) Claims 64-65, 72-73, 78, and 83 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawler in view of Boyer et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0026496; and

(3) Claim 71 was rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawler in view of Knee et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,589,892.

In this response, Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 63-86, as discussed below.

#### 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

With respect to the claims rejected in (1) above, Applicants submit that independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82, as amended, are not anticipated by Lawler. Independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82 are directed to setting and providing notifications for upcoming programs that are not currently available to a user. In particular, each of independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82, as amended, recites providing a user with the opportunity to select a program from "a list of at least one program that will air outside a program listings time frame which is currently available to the user."

Nowhere does Lawler teach such feature of independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82. Rather, Lawler teaches providing a user with a program grid that "covers a time period extending about one week into the past and two weeks into the future," where a user can navigate the program grid and select a program. (see Lawler, FIG. 2; col.7, line 17 - col. 9, line 19; col. 9, lines 44-46). The program grid of Lawler only provides a program listings time frame that is currently available to the user. It does not provide a list of programs that will air outside this time frame.

Applicants specifically recognize the limitations in a program grid such as that described by Lawler: "In known interactive program guide systems, the program listings data made available to a user are limited to a predetermined time frame of program listings." (Specification, p.2, lines 7-10). In Lawler, this predetermined time frame covers two weeks into the future. Thus, Lawler's program grid includes program listings that will air within the predetermined time frame of two weeks. However, each of Applicants' independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82 requires a list of at least one program that will air outside a program listings time frame which is currently available to the user. Since Lawler's program grid only includes programs that will air within a program listings time frame which is currently available to the user, Lawler's program grid is not the same as "a list of at least one program that will air outside a program listings time frame

which is currently available to the user," as required by each of independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82. Accordingly, Applicants traverse the rejection of independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) based on Lawler.

Applicants submit that independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82 are allowable. Claims 66-68, 70, 74, 79-81, and 84-86 depend upon one of allowable independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82, and are thus allowable.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

With respect to claims 64-65, 71-73, 78, and 83 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in (2) and (3) above, such claims depend upon one of allowable independent claims 63, 69, 77, and 82. Therefore, claims 64-65, 71-73, 78, and 83 are also allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Evelyn C. Mak  
Evelyn C. Mak  
Registration No. 50,492  
Attorney for Applicants

Fish & Neave IP Group  
Ropes & Gray LLP  
Customer No. 1473  
1251 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, New York 10020  
Tel.: (212) 596-9000